FILE COPY.

FILED
DEC 21 1903
JAMES H. McKENNEY,
CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1903.

JOHN M. SLOAN ET AL., APPELLANTS, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 453.

JOSEPHINE MITCHELL, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 454.

EMIL PETERS, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES. No. 455.

FRANK A. PETERS, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 456.

WALTER V. PETERS, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 457.

JACOB PETERS, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 458.

SARAH F. MCCHEARY, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 459.

JENNIE M. ARNOLD, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 460.

MITCHELL MONETTE ET AL., APPELLANTS, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 461.

KARRIE M. KARCH, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 462.

THOS. BARADA, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 463.

MARY SAILORS, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 464.

ARTEMISIA FROST, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES. No. 465.

EDWARD KUHN, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES. No. 466.

ETHEL K. RUTLEDGE, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES. No. 467.

CHARLES FROST, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES. No. 468.

CELESTINE KUHN, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES. No. 469.

STELLA KUHN, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES. No. 470.

PHILEMON H. FROST, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 471.

LEONARD FROST, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 472.

MAGGIE E. ROCKWELL, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 473.

MITCHELL MONETTE, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES. No. 474.

JOHN M. SLOAN, APPELLANT, v. THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 475.

MOTION TO ADVANCE.

3115

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1903.

JOHN M. SLOAN ET AL., APPELLANTS, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 453.

JOSEPHINE MITCHELL, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 454.

EMIL PETERS, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES. No. 455.

FRANK A. PETERS, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 456.

WALTER V. PETERS, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 457.

JACOB PETERS, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 458.

SARAH F. MCCREARY, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 459.

JENNIE M. ARNOLD, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 460.

MITCHELL MONETTE ET AL., APPELLANTS, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 461.

KASSIE M. KARCH, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 462.

THOS. BARADA, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 463.

MARY SAILORS, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 464.

ARTEMESIA FROST, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES. No. 465.

EDWARD KUHN, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES. No. 466.

ETHEL K. RUTLEDGE, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES. No. 467.

CHARLES FROST, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES. No. 468.

CELESTINE KUHN, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES. No. 469.

STELLA KUHN, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES. No. 470.

PHILEMON H. FROST, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 471.

LEONARD FROST, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 472.

MAGGIE E. ROCKWELL, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 473.

MITCHELL MONETTE, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES. No. 474.

JOHN M. SLOAN, APPELLANT, *v.* THE UNITED STATES ET AL. No. 475.

MOTION TO ADVANCE.

The appellants in the above-entitled causes, claiming that they are in part of Indian blood and members of the Omaha tribe, instituted suits in the circuit court of the United States for the district of Nebraska, under the provisions of the act of

Congress approved February 6, 1901 (31 Stat., 760), for the purpose of compelling the Government to allot to them certain lands in the Omaha Indian Reservation, Nebraska.

The principal question presented is whether, under section 5 of the act of August 7, 1882 (22 Stat., 341), which provides for the allotment of Indian lands, the appellants are entitled to claim allotments in severalty within the Omaha Reservation.

The circuit court held that the plaintiffs had failed to show themselves entitled to the benefit of the allotment provisions of that act, and this appeal is taken to review the judgment of the circuit court.

I am advised that all of the above-entitled causes are identical as to the question of law involved, and it may be that they can be heard together as one case. In view of the large number of parties interested and the public nature of the question, in which an early decision by this court is deemed important, I move that the cases be advanced on the docket and set down for hearing on such day as may be convenient to the court.

Should this motion be granted, I suggest that the cases be set for hearing early in March next.

Notice of this motion has been served on opposing counsel.

HENRY M. HOYT,
Solicitor-General.

O